

### REMARKS

The indication that claims 7 and 8 would be allowable in independent form has been noted with appreciation. Claim 7 has been amended so as to be in independent form and it is respectfully submitted that these claims can now be formally allowed. As a result of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition to be allowed.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 over Tanaka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Tanaka reference relates to a ceramic material represented by one of three general formulas and is relevant to the present application because, as the Examiner has pointed out, it discloses in column 24 that a dopant such as titanium can be allowed to diffuse into the substrate. The amount of the titanium in the resulting composition is not disclosed. In order to eliminate the anticipation aspect of this rejection, the amount of titanium in the rejected claims has now been specified to be at least 0.02 and the combined amounts of the titanium and M is also at least 0.02. Basis for this change can be found, *inter alia*, in Sample 3 of the working examples.

The translucent ceramics of the present invention are not birefringent and have a refractive index of 1.9 or more, more preferably 2.01 or more, and have the particular merit of being controllable in refractive index and Abbe number (the indication of the variation in refractive index with wavelength) over a wide range. This leads to an increase in the degree of freedom since being able to design translucent ceramics having various Abbe numbers is very useful in designing optical systems which correct for chromatic aberration.

The ability to control the Abbe number with the claimed composition is clearly surprising and unexpected. While Tanaka does teach that the use of titanium dopant is effective to change the refractive index at a single wavelength, namely 633 nm, there is not the slightest hint that the variation of refractive index as a function of wavelength can be controlled. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is unobvious over Tanaka and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant